

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims define patentable subject matter.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1, 2 and 6 provide an antecedent basis for the limitations noted by the Examiner.

With regard to claim 6, the Examiner alleges that “it is not clear which channel transaction and clients are referred [to] by these limitations”. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the language of claim 6 is both definite and proper since the claim recites that “each of the communication channels comprises” the recited “means” elements. In other words, the individual communication channels each comprise the recited “means” elements.

Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to remove the § 112, second paragraph, rejection.

Claims 1-6 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Schaefer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,927; hereafter “Schaefer”). Applicant respectfully traverses the prior art rejection based on Schaefer.

In the October 6 Amendment, Applicant argued that the claimed invention would not have been anticipated by or rendered obvious in view of Schaefer because does not teach or suggest that transmitting information by means of independent transactions, as required by claim 1. Instead, the sections of Schaefer cited by the Examiner in support of the rejection only disclose the basics for transactional communication and definitions of transactions and ACID

properties. Although Schaefer discloses the concept of "global transaction", i.e. involving several transactions, the reference does not teach or suggest that these transactions are independent, as required by the claims. On the contrary, Schaefer discloses that the transactions are dependant (see column 3, lines 13-14, "the database updates are made on an all-or-nothing basis"), i.e., the result of each particular transaction depends on the results of other transactions.

In response, the Examiner (paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action) asserts that the claims do not require "transmitting the information via independent transactions between the service clients (supplier and consumer) and the communication channels". However, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's assertion is not correct since claim 1 recites "transmitting said information by means of independent transactions set up between said supplier and a first communication channel of said chain, between each of the communication channels of said chain, and between a communication channel of said chain and said consumer."

Moreover, the Examiner again has not addressed the fact that Schaefer does not disclose a "chain of communication channels" and/or "independent transactions". Although the Examiner asserts that Schaefer discloses a "chain of communication channels" at col. 2, lines 24-61 and Figs. 1-4G, the cited section simply discusses conventional distributed transaction processing (i.e., where a single transaction is performed by multiple application programs that access one or more databases on one or more computers across a network) which may be global or non global. Schaefer tries to solve the problem of having several transactions between several databases and maintaining synchronicity between them, wherein each of these transactions has

the client as starting point and one database as recipient point. Further, it is readily apparent that Figs. 1-4G of Schaefer do not show a chain of communication channels.

On the other hand, the present invention solves the issue of transmitting information from one source (supplier) to a recipient (consumer) through a chain of channels, each channel being associated with an independent transaction. Such a chain is not disclosed in the portions of Schaefer cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, Schaefer does not teach or suggest the claimed feature of having "said supplier and said consumer being connected by a chain of communication channels", as required by claim 1.

In support of the assertion that Shaefer discloses transmitting information between a supplier and a consumer by means of independent transactions, the Examiner states: "multiple transactions are supported e.g., figures 6A-6D, both non-global and global transactions are supported using ACID properties, multiple phase commit is supported for Distributed Transaction Processing, col. 3, lines 1-53, further asynchronous transactions are supported for distributed transaction processing, col. 13, line 34 - col.. 14. line 49." However, Schaefer does not teach or suggest that these transactions are independent. Instead, Schaefer teaches that the result of each particular transaction depends on the results of other transactions. Multiple phase commit means that "[i]f any of the transaction managers is unable to prepare to commit, the entire global transaction is aborted" (see col. 3, line 31-34), i.e., Schaeffer discloses that the transactions are dependant on each other (see column 3, lines 13-14, "the database updates are made on an all-or-nothing basis").

Although Schaefer discloses the conventional concept of a "global transaction", i.e. involving several transactions, the cited reference does not teach or suggest that these transactions are independent, as required by the claims. On the contrary, Schaeffer discloses that the transactions are dependant (see column 3, lines 13-14, "the database updates are made on an all-or-nothing basis"), i.e., the result of each particular transaction depends on the results of other transactions.

Nonetheless, Applicant has amended claim 1 to improve clarity, and in a manner similar to claims 4 and 6, by reciting "transmitting said information by means of a series of sequential independent transactions ... , wherein each of the transactions between the communication channels of said chain and between the last communication channel of said chain and said consumer is set up if a previous transaction has succeeded." In claims 4 and 6, the feature of "initiating transactions containing said information with said clients if said transaction has succeeded" implicitly means that one waits to assert that the transaction has succeeded before to initiate the next transaction with the next link. On the other hand, Schaefer teaches that the dependent transactions are performed in parallel. In the present invention, there is a sequence of independent transactions.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-6 should be allowable because Schaefer does not teach or suggest all of the features of the claims.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
Application No. 09/807,464

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher R. Lipp
Registration No. 41,157

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 10, 2005